UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,962	08/14/2006	Cyuichi Hoshino	06920/0205318-US0	8575
7278 DARBY & DA	7590 09/17/200 RBY P.C.	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 770	tation	KOSAR, AARON J		
0	Church Street Station New York, NY 10008-0770			PAPER NUMBER
			1651	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/597,962	HOSHINO ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	AARON J. KOSAR	1651			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Ag This action is FINAL . 2b)☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 is/are withdrawn fr 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ access	rom consideration. relection requirement.	≣xaminer.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the orection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11). The oath or declaration is objected to by the Expression 11.	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/14/06;12/20/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I in the reply filed on April 14, 2009 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

The election/restriction requirement is still deemed proper and therefore made FINAL.

Claims 1-10 are pending of which claim 10 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Claims 1-9 are pending and have been examined on the merits.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-4 are objected to because of the following informality: The claims are not in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.75(i) which states, "Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation."

Appropriate correction is suggested.

Application/Control Number: 10/597,962 Page 3

Art Unit: 1651

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: the active, positively recited steps for each step (and substep). In the instant case, please note, although active steps are recited in claim 4 ("kneading") and 6 ("washing"), it is unclear what active manipulations/transformations are required and thus the claims do not recite a complete method. If Applicant intends, for example, for pretreating or contacting the biomass with acid, saccharifying, separating, or spraying, then the claims should so recite. Clarification is required.

Claim 5 recites a "weight-based" ratio; however, it is unclear which ratio (for example w/w, w/v, or another weight-based unit) Applicant intends by the claim. Clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1651

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farone *et al* (U.S. Patent No. 5,597,714).

Farone teaches a method of producing sugars, the method comprising providing hemicellulosic and cellulosic material (a cellulose-based biomass); mixing the solution with sulfuric acid (H₂SO₄) at a concentration of 25-90% (w/w), preferably 70-77%(w/w) and at a temperature below 80°C or 60°C, preferably about 35-40°C (that is, pretreated in 65-85(w/w)% H₂SO₄ at a temperature of 30-70 °C); diluting the sulfuric acid to about 20-30% (w/w) and heating to a temperature of between about 80 and 100° C (that is, 20-60(w/w)% H₂SO₄ at a temperature of 40-100°C). Farone further teaches that the acid-and-heat treating provides a composition comprising acid and sugar fractions wherein the sugar is separated from the acid and washed with liquids eluted through filters (that is, washing filtrate) (see whole document, for example figures 1-3).

Farone does not expressly teach an acid-to-biomass ratio of 0.3 to 5.0 (weight-based) or that the sulfuric acid and mixing be performed by spraying and kneading.

Farone is relied upon for the reasons discussed above. If not expressly taught by Farone, based upon the overall beneficial teaching provided by this reference with respect the addition of acid for the "disruption of bonds" and the effect of increasing acid upon gelation/gel thickness (col 7, lines 12-15) in the manner disclosed therein, the adjustments of particular conventional

Art Unit: 1651

working conditions (e.g., determining one or more suitable acid-to-biomass concentration/ proportions or optimal temperature ranges in which to perform such a biomass sulfuric acid digest reaction), is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan. (see also MPEP 2144.05(II))

Also, if not expressly taught by Farone, based upon the overall beneficial teaching provided by this reference with respect to mixing and separating the materials, in the manner disclosed therein, the adjustments of particular conventional working conditions (e.g., selecting among the modes of mixing/separating known to one of skill, the selecting from one or more suitable mode(s) of mixing/separating in which to perform such a mixing/separating, including separating sugars with a simulated moving bed chromatographic separation device) is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

From the teachings of the reference, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention.

Therefore, the invention as a whole was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Application/Control Number: 10/597,962 Page 6

Art Unit: 1651

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AARON J. KOSAR whose telephone number is (571)270-3054. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30AM-5:00PM, ALT. Friday,EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on (571) 272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aaron J Kosar/ Examiner, Art Unit 1651 /Christopher R. Tate/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655